



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/561,548

03/07/2006

Maria Jose Fernandez

4258-116

9386

23448

7590

09/08/2009

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY / TECHNOLOGY LAW  
PO BOX 14329  
RESEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NC 27709

EXAMINER

WESTERBERG, NISSA M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1618

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/08/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/561,548	<b>Applicant(s)</b> FERNANDEZ ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Nissa M. Westerberg	<b>Art Unit</b> 1618	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Nissa M. Westerberg. (3) \_\_\_\_.

(2) Steven Hultquist. (4) \_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 02 September 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: All pending.

Identification of prior art discussed: Prokop (US 2003/0170313) and Calias (US 2003/0087877).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: In reviewing the proposed response, the 112 - 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph rejection for omitting an essential step would most likely be insufficient to establish that the procedure described results in the formation of nanoparticles and thus would be unpersuasive. The teachings of the cited prior art and evidence that would be useful in demonstrating the unexpected results for the full scope of the claims was discussed.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Jake M. Vu/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1618	
-------------------------------------------------	--